APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,917	07/15/2003	Christopher J. Allen	10761.1457	7149

81331   7590   02/23/2011

Accenture/Finnegan, Henderson,
Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP
901 New York Avenue
Washington, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/23/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

betty.finley@finnegan.com
dianna.williams@finnegan.com
catherine.vanhouten@finnegan.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2010*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *31 July 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   This communication is responsive to the amendment filed December 20th, 2010.

Claims 1-33 are pending. In the amendment filed December 20th, 2010, Claims 1, 8,

12, 19, 23, and 30 are amended and Claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 are independent

Claims. This action is made FINAL.

Claim Interpretation

2.   Claims 1-11 are methods including a database. In light of the specification it is

improper to consider these claims as not being inherently tied to another statutory class

of invention (e.g. computer). As such, Claims 1-11 are currently statutory under 35

U.S.C. 101.

3.   Claims 12-22 recite "a computer-implemented system" with limitations that

explicitly use the computer system (e.g. "a skill-impacting system, the skill-impacting

system storing, using a computer system, skill data..."). This system is interpreted as

having software and hardware elements (e.g. computer) and cannot be reasonably

interpreted as being merely software per se. As such, the claims are currently

considered statutory under 35 U.S.C 101.

4.   Claims 23-33 recite "a computer program stored on a computer readable

medium." The specification does not include examples on what a computer readable

medium includes. The computer readable medium is interpreted to be a statutory form

of computer readable medium (RAM, hard drive, CD-ROM, etc.) since a non-statutory

form of computer readable medium (e.g. signals) cannot be reasonably interpreted as

storing a computer program. As such, the claims are currently considered statutory

under 35 U.S.C 101.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed December 20th, 2010 with respect to Claims 1-33

have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection

below. However, an examiner response is provided below for understanding of the

mappings below.

6.   Applicant's showed support for the conditions for synchronization being

adjustable in paragraph [0027] where the synchronization may occur at an adjustable

periodic interval.

7.   With respect to the applicant's argument with respect to exemplary Claim 1

(including Claims 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30) that the prior art(s) allegedly do not teach

"selectively synchronizing, using a computer system, routing logic of a routing

system… wherein conditions that trigger the synchronizing are adjustable, rule-

based and independent of the updating," the examiner respectfully disagrees. From

McFarlane (e.g. front cover figure), it should be clear that McFarlane is on at least a

computer, thus, the synchronizing uses a computer system. The claim selectively

synchronizes routing logic of a routing system. Routing logic is defined on p. 5 of the

specification as being rules and/or source data. Source data is defined in Claim 2 as

being agent availability and the skill-based information. As such, synchronization

requires updating agent availability and skill based information. In the citings below

(e.g. Shaffer, Fig. 4) Shaffer is seen as teaching this. Shaffer has a step for updating

skill data in a resume/profile (step 220), and then redefine queues and agent groups

based on this updating (Shaffer, Fig. 4 with Shaffer, col. 6, lines 4-15). Redefining

queues updates agent availability and redefining agent groups updates agent skill-

based information (groups based on skill and availability (agent groups defined in

Shaffer, col. 5, lines 36-40)). As seen from the two separate steps in Shaffer, the

updating of the agent skills in the skills database is separate/independent from the

synchronization (updating) of routing logic. This is selective synchronization in that, with

the combination of Kraenzel, the synchronization occurs on a periodic interval only

updating agents that require updating. When a time occurs is seen as being a condition

for the synchronization. This condition for synchronization is adjustable in Kraenzel in

that the user selects/inputs the intervals for synchronization. The period determined by

the user is the rule (e.g. update every hour). A such, "selectively synchronizing, using a

computer system, routing logic of a routing system… wherein conditions that trigger the

synchronizing are adjustable, rule-based and independent of the updating" appears to

be taught by the prior art(s) as seen below

8.   The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously

argued claim(s) or because they are substantially the same as a previously argued

claim(s) in the arguments presented to the examiner, filed December 20th, 2010, are

moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still

considered rejected based on their respective rejections from a prior Office action

(part(s) of recited again below).

Response to Amendment

Specification

9.   In light of the applicant's respective arguments or respective amendments, the

previous specification objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12.   Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent No. 6,453,038 (McFarlane et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,128,380

(Shaffer et al.), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,924 (Kaish et al.), further in view of

U.S. Patent No. 7,219,304 (Kraenzel et al.).

        For **Claim 1**, McFarlane teaches: "A computer-implemented method of

maintaining skills for agents of a contact center, [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 11-28, call

center agents with acquired skills] the method comprising:

- providing profiles in a central skill database for a plurality of agents [McFarlane,

  col. 4, lines 7-28 with McFarlane, Fig. 6, Fig. 6 is a table of the agent skills

  maintained in a database. The database is pictured in Fig. 1. The skills

  associated with an agent is the claimed profile]

- providing a skill-impacting system, the skill impacting system storing, using a

  computer system, data for each of the plurality of agents in the central skill

  database, wherein storing skill data comprises modifying at least one of the

  profiles, [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 24-39 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20 with

  McFarlane, col. 4, lines 13-23 with McFarlane, Fig. 6, Fig. 6 shows the storage of

  data for each agent in the database with skills getting updated in the other

  citings] wherein the skill impacting system includes ..., a customer satisfaction

  scoring system, an a performance metrics scoring system, and wherein the skill

  data includes satisfaction assessments, ... and performance metrics;

  [McFarlane, col. 1, lines 39-42, performance metrics scoring system having

  performance metrics (e.g. speed of processing request), metrics being a

standard unit of measure (which is a score) (basic definition of metric from

google/wikipedia) with McFarlane, col. 11, lines 37-54, shows a similar

performance metric as above (contact handled within a predetermined time) with

"measurable per transaction goals...customer satisfaction." Measuring a

customer satisfaction is a customer satisfaction scoring system including

satisfaction assessments (assess if the customer was satisfied). "If these goals

are consistently met, the agent's skill level is automatically incremented by a

predefined amount" shows that the skill impacting system these skill data]

- receiving from the skill-impacting system skill data for a first agent; [McFarlane,

  col. 11, lines 23-55 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 8-17, ranges of skill from 0-4.

  Thus, when skill is incremented, it cannot exceed 4. Additionally, skill changes

  are reported/recorded in an external source. This requires at least a first agent's

  skill data be received from the skill-impacting system maintaining the skills (in the

  skills DB)]

- updating, using a computer system, a first profile in the central skill database for

  the first agent based on the skill data received [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55

  with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20, ranges of skill from 0-4. Thus, when skill is

  updated incrementally, it cannot exceed 4. So, when skill changes/updates are

  recorded, the updating is based on what the previous value was (3→4 is a

  change but a 4→4 isn't a change and would not be reported)]

- ...such that the routing logic determines which of the plurality of agents are to

  handle a contact based on at least skill data" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 40-59,

"mapped to a selected agent...as a function of agent skill level, agent availability,

customer value, and various other factors"].

McFarlane discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach:

- "...a learning management educational system...completion or results from a

  training course

- ...selectively synchronizing, using a computer system, routing logic of a routing

  system, wherein the routing system comprises a routing database, with skill-

  based information from the first profile in the central skill database ..., wherein

  conditions that trigger the synchronizing are adjustable, rule-based and

  independent of the updating, and the central skill database is separate from the

  routing database."

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Shaffer, teaches:

- "...a learning management educational system...completion or results from a

  training course [Shaffer, Fig. 4 with Shaffer, cols. 5-6, lines 41-15, determine

  needed skills, find idle agents, push training to agents, training complete?]

- ...selectively synchronizing, using a computer system, routing logic of a routing

  system...with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill

  database ..., rule-based and independent of the updating" [Shaffer, Fig. 4

  (specifically, step 220 and 222) with Shaffer, cols. 5-6, lines 41-15, automatically

  update resume (profile of skill) used in routing system with McFarlane, col. 4,

  lines 19-23, McFarlane also includes automatic updating of skills. The

  synchronizing is conditional/adjustable and rule-based in that once/if (condition)

the user defined time to synchronize occurs (as in Kraenzel below) on the interval of time (a rule)[1] the system synchronizes the routing system to redefine queues and agent groups to include the agent who just finished appropriate training for the group (agent groups are defined on Shaffer, col. 5, lines 36-40). Applicant's specification, p. 5, says that the routing logic can be "rules and/or source data." Steps 220 and 222 of Shaffer, indicate a step of updating the skill profile (resume) and then redefining queues and agent groups, thus the updating of the profile is separate/independent from synchronizing the routing logic/source data (queues) to the (skill/agent) data].

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Kaish, teaches:

- "…wherein the routing system comprises a routing database [Kaish, col. 9, lines 35-39, the database queue (routing database) on a separate computer network node than the routing decision making node]

- …and the central skill database is separate from the routing database" [Kaish, col. 9, lines 35-39, the database queue (routing database) on a separate computer network node than the routing decision making node].

With respect to Claim 1, an analogous art, Kraenzel, teaches:

- "…wherein conditions that trigger the synchronizing are adjustable" [Kraenzel, cols. 22-23, lines 60-9 with Kraenzel, col. 41, lines 11-16].

---

[1] or that once/if (condition) training data (skills) is updated (a rule) (however this condition does not appear to be adjustable). Both synchronization on a change and synchronization on a predetermined time interval are both independently supported by [0027].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Shaffer and Kaish with McFarlane because the inventions are directed towards utilizing databases on computers for call processing.

Shaffer's and Kaish's inventions would have been expected to successfully work well with McFarlane's invention because the inventions use databases of agents for call processing. McFarlane discloses a system for integrating agent database access skills in call center agent assignment applications comprising an agent database and routing calls to the proper agents, however McFarlane does not expressly disclose a learning management educational system…completion or results from a training course or selectively synchronizing routing logic of a routing system, wherein the routing system comprises a routing database, with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill database …, wherein the synchronizing is independent of the updating, and the central skill database is separate from the routing database. Shaffer discloses an automatic call distribution and training system (title) comprising a learning management educational system…completion or results from a training course and selectively synchronizing routing logic of a routing system…with skill-based information from the first profile in the central skill database …, wherein the synchronizing is conditional, rule-based and independent of the updating. Kaish discloses a telecommunication network with integrated network-wide automatic call distribution (title) comprising a routing system with a routing database and the central skill database being separate from the routing database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the training and synchronization methods from Shaffer and the

databases Kaish from and install them into the invention of McFarlane, thereby offering

the obvious advantage of automatically providing training to agents based on call queue

activity such that agent use and skill can be matched with the statistical demands and

needs of the business (Shaffer, col. 3, lines 20-36 (and Shaffer, col. 6, lines 4-22)).

Adding Kaish makes the queue in McFarlane (queue in at least McFarlane, col. 8, lines

24-26) implemented on a different computer database thereby offering the obvious

advantage of having a queue that has the widely known characteristic of increased

access speed by using a database, and achieving an alternative embodiment by design

of Kaish (Kaish, col. 9, lines 31-45). It should be also noted that Shaffer also contains

at least a similar queue (Shaffer, Fig. 1 "ACD Queue"). It also should be noted that

McFarlane at least appears to make room for an embodiment using many databases in

McFarlane, col. 4, lines 45-53.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Kraenzel with McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish)

because both inventions are directed towards synchronizing data.

Kraenzel's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish)'s invention because both inventions

synchronize data. McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish) discloses a system for

integrating agent database access skills in call center agent assignment applications

comprising an agent database and routing calls to the proper agents. However,

McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish) does not expressly disclose wherein conditions that trigger the synchronizing are adjustable and wherein synchronizing the routing system is automatically run at a predetermined time interval (e.g. Claim 6). Kraenzel discloses a system and method for developing and administering web applications and services from a workflow, enterprise, and mail-enabled web application server and platform (title) comprising user adjustable synchronization settings and synchronizing automatically at a predetermined time interval(s).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the synchronization methods from Kraenzel and install them into the invention of McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish), thereby offering the obvious advantage of keeping data automatically up to date.

Claim 2 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, further comprising:

- receiving a contact from a customer; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 28-33, incoming contact (e.g. call), identifies customers]

- processing routing logic in the routing system to select a second agent from the plurality of agents; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60, an agent will be selected based on availability. Thus if one agent isn't available another will be selected] and

- routing the contact to the second agent; [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60, "calling party is connected with a selected agent"]

- wherein the routing logic includes routing rules and routing source data for performing the step of routing, [McFarlane, col. 5, lines 49-54, rules based call management with McFarlane, cols. 7-8, lines 20-11, rules engine and rules data section. Source data handled in next limitation] the routing source data including agent availability and the skill-based information in the routing system" [Shaffer, Fig. 4 with McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60, redefining queues and agent groups (step 222) redefines agent availability and the skill-based information (groups defined on skills)].

Claim 3 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing system is accomplished for a plurality of profiles in the central skill database" [Shaffer, col. 6, lines 10-18, training agents results in synchronizing a plurality of profiles].

Claim 4 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, wherein updating the first profile is triggered when skill data is received from the skill-impacting system" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 26-65 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20, automatically reevaluate and reassign skill levels, update augment (increment) skill level based on change to skill levels (0-4)].

Claim 5 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing system is automatically run when triggered by an event" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 28-60, the event being selecting an agent, select agent from pool of agents. Additionally,

agent availability and the skill-based information (groups defined on skills in Shaffer

(Fig. 4)) is at least based on current agent availability upon call routing (selection of

agent)].

Claim 6 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and

Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, wherein synchronizing the routing

system is automatically run at a predetermined time interval" [Kraenzel, cols. 22-23,

lines 60-9].

Claim 7 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and

Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 1, wherein the skill data is received from a

plurality of skill-impacting systems" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55 with McFarlane, col.

12, lines 17-20, one system being the supervisor/admin and the other being the

"procsee" (which appears to be a typo and is supposed to be a process) engine].

For Claim 8, McFarlane teaches:

- …maintaining a plurality of profiles in a central skill database corresponding to a

   plurality of agents, [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 7-28 with McFarlane, Fig. 6, Fig. 6 is

   a table of the agent skills maintained in a database. The database is pictured in

   Fig. 1. The skills associated with an agent is the claimed profile] wherein the

   plurality of profiles comprise skill-based ratings for a plurality of skills;

   [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 22-26 with McFarlane, Fig. 6, various skill ratings per

   profile in Fig. 6]

- storing, using a computer system, skill data for each of the plurality of agents in

   the central skill database of at least one skill-impacting system, wherein the step

of storing skill data comprises modifying at least one of the plurality of profiles,

[McFarlane, col. 11, lines 24-39 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20 with

McFarlane, col. 4, lines 13-23 with McFarlane, Fig. 6, Fig. 6 shows the storage of

data for each agent in the database with skills getting updated in the other

citings] wherein the skill impacting system includes…a customer satisfaction

scoring system, and a performance metrics scoring system, and wherein the skill

data includes satisfaction assessments…and performance metrics; [McFarlane,

col. 1, lines 39-42, performance metrics scoring system having performance

metrics (e.g. speed of processing request), metrics being a standard unit of

measure (which is a score) (basic definition of metric from google/wikipedia) with

McFarlane, col. 11, lines 37-54, shows a similar performance metric as above

(contact handled within a predetermined time) with "measurable per transaction

goals…customer satisfaction." Measuring a customer satisfaction is a customer

satisfaction scoring system including satisfaction assessments (assess if the

customer was satisfied). "If these goals are consistently met, the agent's skill

level is automatically incremented by a predefined amount" shows that the skill

impacting system these skill data]

- using the skill data from the at least one skill-impacting system to update, using a

  computer system, the plurality of profiles in the central skill database;

  [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 23-55 with McFarlane, col. 12, lines 17-20, ranges of

  skill from 0-4. Thus, when skill is updated incrementally, it cannot exceed 4. So,

  when skill changes/updates are recorded, the updating is based on what the

previous value was (3→4 is a change by a 4→4 isn't a change and would not be
reported (using the skill data from the at least one skill-impacting system))]

- … wherein the source data is based on agent skills and configures routing logic
to make routing decisions" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 40-59, "mapped to a selected
agent…as a function of agent skill level, agent availability, customer value, and
various other factors"].

McFarlane discloses the above limitations but does not expressly teach: "A
computer-implemented method for synchronizing skill data in a contact center,
comprising:

- …a learning management educational system…completion or results from a
training course

- …maintaining, using a computer system, source data in a routing system for the
contact center, wherein the routing system comprises a routing database, and

- …selectively updating, using a computer system, the source data based on
agent skills with skill-based ratings in the central skill database for reconfiguring
the routing logic, wherein conditions that trigger the updating of the source data
are adjustable, rule-based and independent of updating the plurality of profiles,
and wherein the central skill database is separate from the routing database."

With respect to Claim 8, an analogous art, Shaffer, teaches: "A method for
synchronizing skill data in a contact center [Shaffer, Fig. 4, updating skills and
queues/groups] comprising:

- …a learning management educational system…completion or results from a

   training course [Shaffer, Fig. 4 with Shaffer, cols. 5-6, lines 41-15, determine

   needed skills, find idle agents, push training to agents, training complete?]

- …maintaining, using a computer system, source data in a routing system for the

   contact center, [Shaffer, Fig. 4 with McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60, redefining

   queues and agent groups (step 222) redefines agent availability and the skill-

   based information (groups defined on skills). Agent availability and skill-based

   information are considered as being source data (as it was in Claim 2 above]

- …selectively updating, using a computer system, the source data based on

   agent skills with skill-based ratings in the central skill database for reconfiguring

   the routing logic, …, rule-based and independent of updating the plurality of

   profiles" [Shaffer, Fig. 4 (specifically, step 220 and 222) with Shaffer, cols. 5-6,

   lines 41-15, automatically update resume (profile of skill) used in routing system

   with McFarlane, col. 4, lines 19-23, McFarlane also includes automatic updating

   of skills. The synchronizing is conditional/adjustable and rule-based in that

   once/if (condition) the user defined time to synchronize occurs (as in Kraenzel

   below) on the interval of time (a rule) (or that once/if (condition) training data

   (skills) is updated (a rule)) the system synchronizes the routing system to

   redefine queues and agent groups to include the agent who just finished

   appropriate training for the group (agent groups are defined on Shaffer, col. 5,

   lines 36-40). Applicant's specification, p. 5, says that the routing logic can be

   "rules and/or source data." Steps 220 and 222 of Shaffer, indicate a step of

updating the skill profile (resume) and then redefining queues and agent groups,

thus the updating of the profile is separate/independent from synchronizing the

routing logic/source data (queues) to the (skill/agent) data].

With respect to Claim 8, an analogous art, Kaish, teaches:

- "...wherein the routing system comprises a routing database, [Kaish, col. 9, lines

  35-39, the database queue (routing database) on a separate computer network

  node than the routing decision making node] and

- and wherein the central skill database is separate from the routing database"

  [Kaish, col. 9, lines 35-39, the database queue (routing database) on a separate

  computer network node than the routing decision making node].

With respect to Claim 8, an analogous art, Kraenzel, teaches:

- "...wherein conditions that trigger the updating of the source data are adjustable"

  [Kraenzel, cols. 22-23, lines 60-9 with Kraenzel, col. 41, lines 11-16].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Shaffer and Kaish with McFarlane because the inventions are

directed towards utilizing databases on computers for call processing.

Shaffer's and Kaish's inventions would have been expected to successfully work

well with McFarlane's invention because the inventions use databases of agents for call

processing. McFarlane discloses a system for integrating agent database access skills

in call center agent assignment applications comprising an agent database and routing

calls to the proper agents, however McFarlane does not expressly disclose

synchronizing skill data in a contact center, a learning management educational

system...completion or results from a training course, maintaining source data in a

routing system for the contact center, selectively updating the source data based on

agent skills with skill-based ratings in the central skill database for reconfiguring the

routing logic, wherein the updating the source data is independent of updating the

plurality of profiles nor a routing system comprising a routing database where the

central skill database is separate from the routing database. Shaffer discloses an

automatic call distribution and training system comprising synchronizing skill data in a

contact center, a learning management educational system...completion or results from

a training course, maintaining source data in a routing system for the contact center,

and selectively updating the source data based on agent skills with skill-based ratings in

the central skill database for reconfiguring the routing logic, wherein the updating the

source data is conditional, rule-based and independent of updating the plurality of

profiles. Kaish discloses a telecommunication network with integrated network-wide

automatic call distribution (title) comprising a routing system with a routing database

and the central skill database being separate from the routing database.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the synchronization methods, training methods, and source data from

Shaffer and install them into the invention of McFarlane, thereby offering the obvious

advantage of automatically providing training to agents based on call queue activity

such that agent use and skill can be matched with the statistical demands and needs of

the business (Shaffer, col. 3, lines 20-36 (and Shaffer, col. 6, lines 4-22)). Adding Kaish

makes the queue in McFarlane (queue in at least McFarlane, col. 8, lines 24-26)

implemented on a different computer database thereby offering the obvious advantage

of having a queue that has the widely known characteristic of increased access speed

by using a database, and achieving an alternative embodiment by design of Kaish

(Kaish, col. 9, lines 31-45). It should be also noted that Shaffer also contains at least a

similar queue (Shaffer, Fig. 1 "ACD Queue"). It also should be noted that McFarlane at

least appears to make room for an embodiment using many databases in McFarlane,

col. 4, lines 45-53.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Kraenzel with McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish)

because both inventions are directed towards synchronizing data.

Kraenzel's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish)'s invention because both inventions

synchronize data. McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish) discloses a system for

integrating agent database access skills in call center agent assignment applications

comprising an agent database and routing calls to the proper agents. However,

McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish) does not expressly disclose wherein

conditions that trigger the synchronizing are adjustable and wherein synchronizing the

routing system is automatically run at a predetermined time interval (e.g. Claim 6).

Kraenzel discloses a system and method for developing and administering web

applications and services from a workflow, enterprise, and mail-enabled web application

server and platform (title) comprising user adjustable synchronization settings and

synchronizing automatically at a predetermined time interval(s).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
invention to take the synchronization methods from Kraenzel and install them into the
invention of McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer and Kaish), thereby offering the obvious
advantage of keeping data automatically up to date.

Claim 9 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and
Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 8, further comprising:

- identifying at least one contact characteristic for a customer; [McFarlane, col. 4,
  lines 28-45, service needed by the calling party] and

- selecting an agent from the plurality of agents for the customer; [McFarlane, col.
  4, lines 39-60, "mapped to a selected agent…as a function of agent skill level,
  agent availability, customer value, and various other factors"]

- wherein selecting comprises processing the routing logic to consider the skill-
  based ratings of the plurality of agents in view of the at least one contact
  characteristic" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 39-60 mapped to a selected agent…as a
  function of agent skill level, agent availability, customer value, and various other
  factors, performing requested function (service required)].

Claim 10 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and
Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 9, wherein selecting further comprises
choosing an agent who is a best-fit" [McFarlane, col. 4, lines 51-60 with McFarlane, col.
5, lines 61-65 with McFarlane, col. 8, lines 7-11, "mapped to a selected agent…as a
function of agent skill level, agent availability, customer value, and various other factors"

with "adapt the operation of the call center 100 to most effectively match the

preferences of a calling customer" appears to be a best-fit].

Claim 11 can be mapped to McFarlane (as modified by Shaffer, Kaish, and

Kraenzel) as follows: "The method from claim 8 wherein maintaining the plurality of

profiles is triggered by the occurrence of a skill-changing event indicated by the at least

one skill-impacting system" [McFarlane, col. 11, lines 26-65 with McFarlane, col. 12,

lines 17-20, automatically reevaluate and reassign skill levels, update augment

(increment) skill level based on change to skill levels (0-4)].

Claims 12-18 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 1-7, respectfully, in addition to a system and some modules for performing the

method steps of Claims 1-7, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 12-18 are rejected for the

same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Claims 19-22 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 8-11, respectfully, in addition to a system and some modules for performing

the method steps of Claims 8-11, respectfully. Therefore, Claims 19-22 are rejected for

the same reasons as stated above with respect to Claims 8-11, respectfully.

Claims 23-29 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 1-7, respectfully, in addition to a computer program on a computer readable

medium and some code for performing the method steps of Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Therefore, Claims 23-29 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect

to Claims 1-7, respectfully.

Claims 30-33 encompass substantially the same scope of the invention as that

of Claims 8-11, respectfully, in addition to a computer program on a computer readable

medium and some code for performing the method steps of Claims 8-11, respectfully.

Therefore, Claims 30-33 are rejected for the same reasons as stated above with respect

to Claims 8-11, respectfully.

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

14.   Any prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Applicant is advised that, although not used in the rejections

above, prior art cited on any PTO-892 form and not relied upon is considered materially

relevant to the applicant's claimed invention and/or portions of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-

8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F

10am-6:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Apu M. Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BRENT STACE/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161